UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY CIVIL ACTION NO 16-MD-2738 (FLW) (LHG)

IN RE JOHNSON & JOHNSON : TRANSCRIPT OF
POWDER PRODUCTS MARKETING, : STATUS CONFERENCE

SALES PRACTICES.

: DECEMBER 7, 2017

CLARKSON S. FISHER UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE 402 EAST STATE STREET, TRENTON, NJ 08608

B E F O R E: THE HONORABLE FREDA L. WOLFSON, USDJ

APPEARANCES:

BEASLEY ALLEN, ESQUIRES

BY: P. LEIGH O'DELL, ESQUIRE (ALABAMA)

-and-

ASHCRAFT & GEREL, ESQUIRES

BY: MICHELLE A. PARFITT, ESQUIRE (VIRGINIA)

CHRIS TISI, ESQUIRE (VIRGINIA)

-and-

COHEN, PLACITELLA & ROTH, ESQUIRES

BY: CHRISTOPHER M. PLACITELLA, ESQUIRE

On Behalf of the Plaintiffs Steering Committee

DRINKER, BIDDLE & REATH, ESQUIRES

BY: SUSAN M. SHARKO, ESQUIRE

JULIE L. TERSIGNI, ESQUIRE

-and-

SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM, ESQUIRES

BY: JOHN H. BEISNER, ESQUIRE (WASHINGTON, D.C.)

On behalf of Defendant Johnson & Johnson

(Continued.)

* * * * *

VINCENT RUSSONIELLO, RPR, CRR, CCR OFFICIAL U.S. COURT REPORTER (609) 588-9516

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

SEYFARRTH & SHAW, ESQUIRES

BY: THOMAS L. LOCKE, ESQUIRE (WASHINGTON D.C.)

-and
THE AXELROD FIRM, ESQUIRES

BY: SHERYL L. AXELROD, ESQUIRE (PENNSYLVANIA)
On Behalf of Defendant PCPC

COUGHLIN DUFFY, ESQUIRES
BY: LORNA A. DOTRO, ESQUIRE
MARK K. SILVER, ESQUIRE
-and-

GORDON & REES, ESQUIRES
BY: ANN THORNTON FIELD, ESQUIRE (PENNSYLVANIA)
 NANCY M. ERFLE, ESQUIRE (OREGON)
On behalf of Defendant Imerys Talc America

CERTIFICATE

PURSUANT TO TITLE 28, U.S.C., SECTION 753, THE FOLLOWING TRANSCRIPT IS CERTIFIED TO BE AN ACCURATE TRANSCRIPTION OF MY STENOGRAPHIC NOTES IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

S/Vincent Russoniello
VINCENT RUSSONIELLO, CCR
OFFICIAL U.S. COURT REPORTER

3

```
4
1
             (In open court.)
 2
            THE CLERK: All rise.
 3
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Thank you. You may be seated.
 4
             (Appearances noted.)
 5
 6
            JUDGE WOLFSON: On the record.
 7
            We've been having a discussion with regard to
8
    the application to quash the notice of deposition of
 9
    Dr. Fred Pooley in Wales, and there had been an
    application made by the plaintiff to quash the cross
10
    designation, that it was pending before Judge Pisano.
11
12
            We've had a discussion that the defendants
13
    were going to file a response today. But after
14
    further inquiry, one, with regard to the need for
15
    moving forward immediately, what the health of Dr.
16
    Pooley is, what his role is, whether as a fact or
17
    expert witness is, many of the issues are not really
    ripe today and as a result Ms. Sharko on behalf of J&J
18
    has indicated that she has withdrawn the cross notice
19
    for deposition of Dr. Pooley in the MDL.
20
21
            MS. SHARKO: Correct. Limited to the MDL.
2.2
    And the matter can now be litigated in the state
    courts in the asbestos cases.
23
24
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Fine. I have nothing to do
25
    with those. So that is withdrawn.
```

```
Please notify Judge Pisano so he doesn't have
1
 2
    to waste his time or you spend your money having him
 3
    review the materials.
            MS. SHARKO: We will.
 4
 5
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Thank you.
 6
            Speaking now for a few moments or longer about
7
    the issue of experts and ultimately what may result by
8
    timing, Daubert, et cetera.
            I had directed when we were here the last
 9
    time, and it was in a case management order, that the
10
    plaintiff had to identify experts and their areas of
11
12
    expertise in a basic summary.
13
            I guess what I want to say -- I didn't count
    them all. What do we have, about 30 you've
14
    identified?
15
16
            MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, there are about 37.
17
            JUDGE WOLFSON: 37. I will tell you, frankly,
    I was taken aback when I saw that submission. It was
18
    not what I expected. I don't think it's a real
19
20
    submission. I think it's the universe of anyone you
21
    could possibly identify. It's not telling me who you
2.2
    really are focused on.
23
            I don't think it's helpful. I don't think
24
    it's helpful to the defendants. It's certainty not
25
    helpful to the Court because it's not narrowing where
```

```
6
    we are. Probably everybody could go out and figure
1
 2
    out anybody who could possibly serve as a plaintiff's
 3
    expert in these areas.
            It didn't do it. It's not what I expected.
 4
 5
    You are not having 37 experts in this case. I know
 6
    that and you know that.
 7
            MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, may I be heard on
8
    that?
 9
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Yes.
10
            You are going to tell me you are going to have
    37 experts?
11
12
            MS. PARFITT: I want to clarify.
13
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay.
            MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, when you asked us to
14
15
    identify the experts that we've been working with,
16
    that is indeed what we do, and I can represent to the
17
    Court that all of those 37 individuals are people
18
    that -- members of our expert committee or leadership
    that we've been working with over the last year.
19
    areas, and I think it's important because there
20
21
    were --
2.2
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I'm not so concerned about who
23
    you work with or consult with. I was looking for
24
    those who you were going to be designating as your
25
    experts in this case who would render reports, so that
```

7 we could assess them and make any appropriate motions 1 2 and decide whether they would testify at a trial. 3 MS. PARFITT: If I may, your Honor? JUDGE WOLFSON: 4 Yes. MS. PARFITT: The areas, and I realize that 5 6 the numbers were large, and indeed we have been 7 working with regard to reports and I thought it might 8 be helpful to the Court to know the areas. There were almost 17 different areas from 9 genetics to radiation oncologists, to regulatory 10 individuals, epidemiologists, statisticians, chemists, 11 12 biomedical engineers, OBGYNs, geologists, 13 pathologists, toxicologists, microscopists, material 14 science, occupational health, public health, quality 15 control and environmental sciences. 16 And the only reason, your Honor, I take a 17 moment to go through is those were all very different specialties. And as we have been looking at this case 18 19 and its broader perspective with regard to what is talcum powder products and the issue of the 20 21 constituents within that, it expanded the list of 2.2 experts that we felt we might introduce to the Court 23 in the fields of material science, in geology, in 24 chemistry and occupational health. 25 So what we had done, as we have worked in

2.2

earnest to develop actual reports for this individual, I understand what the Court is saying. It's an overwhelming number of individuals. But, frankly, the specialty for most of them, of those 17 or so specialties, there are probably about two.

There are only two categories where there might be more than two experts designated in those particular disciplines. There is overlap. Some experts might have been a regulatory expert, but also a toxicologist and pharmacologist. And what we would try to do is keep that individual in one wheelhouse so there wasn't a duplicative nature in this court.

I only say that, your Honor, believe me, I'm not arguing, I'm just simply representing to the Court what that world was of experts, and it was not intended to do anything other than represent to the Court, as you had asked: Who have you been working with in earnest? How have you been developing the opinions that you intend to show the Court in order to actually frame this case? And that is what we have been doing.

As you can imagine, your Honor, with the issues, with testing, the samples, the asbestos issue, that has been a new array of experts that really haven't been previously introduced to the Court. So

```
the numbers were larger than what the Court might have
1
 2
    expected.
 3
            The other thing is, we had not completed and
    still have not completed our discovery. As your Honor
 4
    has just indicated, as to Imerys, we'll get their
 5
    documents the first part of January.
 6
 7
            JUDGE WOLFSON: My understanding is that most
8
    of them have been produced.
            This is a supplemental production, isn't it?
 9
            MS. DOTRO: Your Honor, we've made a full and
10
    complete production.
11
12
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Right. This is based on
13
    conferences you've had --
            MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, Imerys has been
14
15
    very, very cooperative.
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I understand. But what I'm
16
17
    indicating is, I don't know how much more is really
18
    coming anyway that is going to make a difference.
            MS. PARFITT: We don't either.
19
20
            It's a situation sometimes that maybe the last
21
    round of documents are the ones that are most
2.2
    important. I don't know that either, your Honor. I
23
    haven't seen them. And I'm not suggesting that we
24
    haven't gotten waves of discovery from all three of
    the defendants.
25
```

My point is simply, we are waiting to see what 1 2 the discovery looks like at the conclusion of the production just as we are looking at what does the 3 discovery look like at the conclusion of production 4 issues with regard to interrogatories and RFPs. 5 THE COURT: Excuse me one second. 6 7 (Pause.) 8 JUDGE WOLFSON: We're not putting our hands on that submission because it wasn't filed on the docket 9 and I don't have my paper copy of your experts. 10 Do you have an extra copy of that? 11 12 MS. PARFITT: I do. 13 Your Honor, I think you understand as well that there have not been depositions taken. There 14 15 were approximately three corporate depositions taken 16 of Imerys, a similar number for J&J, and only two taken of PCPC. 17 So, again, we're not completely certain at 18 this point without the discovery what material will 19 ultimately be provided to our experts. 20 21 Again, the Court appreciates our experts will 2.2 also be relying on information from corporate 23 depositions, third-party depositions. We just haven't 24 done that process. It's not a blame. It's just we

25

haven't completed them.

JUDGE WOLFSON: I understand.

2.2

And, by the way, I was surprised, Ms. Sharko, I hadn't gotten a letter from you when this came out, and I thought, Well, maybe the defendant doesn't have a problem with it. I thought you would be getting a letter to me that same afternoon, but I didn't get one. I'll hear from you in a moment.

I guess the other issue that I perhaps want to raise when you are talking about all of these things as well is, putting aside this asbestos component which was not part of earlier science or whatever and certainly wasn't part of our science day here, it's not what you presented and maybe that's not what's been tried yet, so that's a new issue.

But the other issues, while certainly I said at the beginning of this case when the defendants were taking the position: Judge, we've already done discovery everywhere and we are not starting from square one. I said, No we are not starting from square one. But this is a different case and they may decide to do different things here.

On a lot of those issues, we're not writing on a blank slate. There has been discovery in many other cases, deposition being taken. I guess what you are telling me now is, you don't like the job that's maybe

2.2

been done in other cases where you've won or lost, and you've decided how to do things better now. But we're not on a blank slate.

So I'm a little confused about -- I don't see this case as a case where we're starting with a brand new case from square one that's the first time being brought. It's not. And we have many of the same players as lawyers here.

So it's not like you need to learn what's going on and what the discovery has been. Put aside the written discovery. There is now supplementation here. But were no deps taken before?

MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, actually a very limited number. As I indicated to the Court, there were only three corporate depositions taken on Imerys, the same number for J&J, and only two for PCPC.

So whether good or bad, and I don't pass judgment on that, and I'm not suggesting it wasn't done well in the state court. Obviously, the results would demonstrate it was done well.

But the point of fact is, there has been limited depositions that have been taken in the case and there are additional deponents that we would like to take.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Have you identified them?

2.2

MS. PARFITT: We had identified preliminarily some deponents with J&J, but that was before we started this process of getting the additional documents, your Honor. I believe your Honor indicated: Let's get the documents first. No depositions until we have the documents.

That's of great importance and we agree with the Court because we don't want to unnecessarily take people's deposition that we don't need. We see a document. We may not need to take that individual's deposition. So I think that was well thought out. It's a good plan.

We get the documents and then we are in a much better position to assess who we really want, so that we're not coming to the Court and saying: There's a plethora of people and it's a go fish. We don't want to do that. We understand. We heard the Court a year ago. That's not what we're asking to do.

So we are trying to be informed with regard to our decision-making with the types of individuals that we designate. And all that plays into this larger picture of the discovery role that unfortunately just happens with cases and this case in particular.

We do have three defendants in the other litigation. There's been two defendants. We haven't

had PCPC. It plays a role. I'm not saying it's the only reason.

JUDGE WOLFSON: I don't think that's a huge role here.

MS. PARFITT: Sure. That's why I'm qualifying that, your Honor.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Yes.

2.2

MR. TISI: Can I just add here, we started out when we had the first status conference, the first one I was at in February, there was a representation that the state court production of documents was everything that we needed to have to do this case.

We now, as we sit here today, have almost twice as many documents as we had in the state court proceedings. It's doubled, if not more. We've gotten third-party documents that because of various reasons in the state court they don't have subpoena power to get the kinds of people that you are more easily able to get in the MDL.

When we met with Judge Pisano he said -- he suggested -- let me make one other point.

In the California case, when the Judge wrote the opinion in the California case, one of the things that she noted was that there was additional discovery that needed to be done. That case was done -- she

2.2

understood that there was a limitation because they had to get the case to trial, but that there were areas that the parties needed to further explore in the case.

When we raised the issue with Judge Pisano back in October, we told him at that point there were four people -- and we actually raised this with your Honor back in June -- there were four people that we had asked for depositions from, from J&J, four people from Imerys, and there were additional third parties we wanted to take as well based upon the Court's original description of the science in this case.

We explained to the Judge, to Judge Pisano in October, that there were additional depositions we needed to take. What Judge Pisano said at that point was: Why don't we wait until the document production is complete so we could see what the world is.

He understood that we doubled the number of documents we got when J&J and Imerys originally said the document production was complete. We now have doubled that. What he suggested was that we meet in January and further discuss the deposition protocol, an opportunity, what we needed to do.

Candidly, one of the things we are doing in the next week or two is sitting down and trying to

2.2

decide what depositions we need to take in order to support the case. Candidly, as somebody who is trying to run discovery and deal with the discovery issues, there are issues that we want to explore, both science, what they knew and when they knew it, third-party depositions.

We think it's important for the thousands of women who are in this MDL as opposed to what had gone on in the states previously. So while we're not really starting with a blank slate, there is a lot that we feel like we need to do to adequately represent these women.

And so we think there is a period of time that we need to have in order to collect the information, take the depositions, get them to our experts, so we can winnow down the number of experts that we have.

It's very difficult for us to identify at this point all the experts we need, not having done the discovery we feel like we need, in order to represent the women in this case.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Ms. Sharko.

MS. SHARKO: The number of documents produced has not doubled.

What we did, and we've been over and over this

2.2

with the plaintiff, is a number of the complaints we just redid the production. Are there new documents in there? Yes, but not double the number. They asked for four depositions. We agreed to produce those people and talk about dates. Enough is enough.

The discovery from the defendants is not going to prove for the plaintiff that there is scientifically sound evidence that the perineal use of talcum powder products causes ovarian cancer. There has been numerous trials. There was a Daubert-like proceeding in New Jersey. There was a Daubert-like proceeding in California.

Your Honor asked plaintiff to identify the experts that they wanted to use to prove their case, not the experts they were consulting with. We got a list of 37 people. I agree that's an absurd list. It's like everybody in the phonebook. But if that's what they want, then we should get 37 expert reports soon. We don't need to wait for the document production which, by the way --

JUDGE WOLFSON: We're waiting for the document production -- I'll just stop you there. That I'm waiting for. We'll get the document production. But I don't know, for many of the science experts, I don't really understand why these corporate deps are

needed by way of depositions to start getting expert reports rolling on the science? I told you we're

25

focusing on general causation first.

2.2

Now, you've done lots. You've been consulting with experts for a long time about the science. Put aside issues of, quote, when did J&J become aware of X or maybe a particular study or a complaint. You know what the studies are. You want to make sure you know what all the studies are that are out there.

Your experts are going to be opining on the science of that: What supports a connection between this product, whether pure talc, whether with asbestos in it or whatever it might be, can cause ovarian cancer?

So that science focus, I don't see how this changed by any of the discovery. I understand you may have different kinds of experts and issues. The asbestos you told me you haven't done yet. Okay. I get it. That you did not have opinions on yet.

But I'm still trying to figure out: What in here is going to affect those scientific opinions?

MR. TISI: Let me give you an example, your Honor.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay.

MR. TISI: If you have a toxicologist who testifies that based upon their review -- their own people, that there are admissions you can get that --

2.2

I don't want to lay out our entire case in the open courtroom.

THE COURT: I don't think there are any surprises here, though. Go ahead.

MR. TISI: But we do believe that there are admissions in the documents that we need to get from witnesses, get them on the record, who will admit to certain things that support the issues of causation, biologic plausibility, relevance, the fit of certain studies that were done.

JUDGE WOLFSON: I understand why you think that will bolster your case --

MR. TISI: Correct.

JUDGE WOLFSON -- if you believe that there are admissions. But that does not go to what your own experts will be opining upon based upon their own review of what the science was at the time and over these years in this area regardless of whether they admit it or not.

That's great for a trial, to put that before a jury: Look, they admitted there was a problem here.

I understand that. But for your experts to opine, they have to independently and their opinions stand on their own as to what they are relying on for the science.

2.2

MR. TISI: One of the things they can rely on, your Honor -- and using admissions is just an example -- they can rely on: Well, I read the deposition testimony of Dr. X and they understood that there was biologically plausible mechanisms that would support causation in this case.

JUDGE WOLFSON: That's like an add-on. But that doesn't support their own opinion of whether it stands on its own.

MR. TISI: Well, these are not done in the abstract.

JUDGE WOLFSON: I'm not going to resolve this issue today. You are going to go one-by-one of whoever they want to request. But what I do want to do, I want to set some parameters on timing today and it's not going to be open-ended on starting these experts going.

Certainly, I'm willing to, whether it's phasing a bit, because if you are going to have experts on the asbestos component because it is new to you, that that requires a little more time.

I don't think many of these others do, and so there may be a staggering of which reports are due and when and we're going to get them going. Because, frankly, if it's 20 experts or 15 experts, we can't

attack them all at once anyway.

2.2

They are going to want to take a deposition of an expert before they bring a Daubert motion. I don't like Daubert motions without an expert of a dep. So that process can begin. They're not all necessarily going to be produced on the same day.

You thought there were. I'm thinking there may be a way of dealing with this, and some of the delay on someone who might be a new kind of expert and not delaying the old kind. So I'm throwing those things out today.

Do you have a meeting with Judge Pisano set up?

MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, we do not at this point. It's certainly something that I know he would be amenable to and perhaps that's something we could do to talk generally about a mutual discovery plan that the parties could talk about and agree upon, that we could then present to you, your Honor, that we sit down and we talk about the necessary discovery we need to do, try and get some accord with the other side, and then make a presentation to you, your Honor.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Yes, Ms. Sharko.

MS. SHARKO: Discovery plan sounds like delay.

I think we should go back to your Honor's question,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

which is: Who do you really need before we can get expert reports? JUDGE WOLFSON: Well, this is what I would like to do: First of all, based upon the schedule that you've already admitted to me on the documents, J&J's full production of it, and if you are going to have some objections you want to present to Judge Pisano that you want to have reviewed by December 20th, I think PCPC is somewhere in this month, December 15th, and Imerys your last supplemental is January 5th, we're talking basically three weeks from now with a holiday in between. lot is getting done in December other than this document discovery. Let's be practical about it. So once that's complete, what I expect to see

So once that's complete, what I expect to see is that by the second week in January, there is a request for the depositions you want of fact witnesses, and then that can be teed up for Judge Pisano if you have objections to any of the individuals, and get to those quickly and start scheduling the dates for those. I don't know how many there will be.

As far as then the experts, I don't understand -- you have the universe of 37. When are you going to narrow that?

2.2

MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, I think that's why I like your suggestion, frankly, that maybe if we could have a little time to put together -- and it's not a delay plan. It is a discovery plan. It makes sense. I think that helps us coordinate the discovery that's necessary with the experts that are necessary.

Your Honor has just talked a bit about perhaps staggering that process of putting that kind of plan together might help us answer that question and provide the Court a little bit more guidance, and it's not a delay mechanism.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Well, we're not going to delay anywhere. Now, we're kicking in. We've gotten through a year of fighting over written discovery and a lot of other things. We're there now and now we move.

MS. PARFITT: I guess my point is, your Honor, it's a processing part now, now that we're getting what we're getting from the defendants as you've indicated. We have the opportunity to process, see how that fits in with the various experts. I think having that discussion with the defendants is an orderly way, and we present that then to the Court, talk with Judge Pisano.

As you've indicated, we present a list of

2.2

folks that we feel should be deposed in the coming months, get that done. That seems to be an orderly way. We can request a meeting with Judge Pisano. We can certainly do that as well. There wasn't one planned. We can certainly do that.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Well, there is no reason to present anything if you don't need anything. But I'm just thinking maybe it could be helpful to hash out some of these things particularly because he in the first instance will deal with the issue of whether there are objections to any of these depositions.

MS. PARFITT: That's right.

JUDGE WOLFSON: So I would like to see you identify who you want to depose by January 10.

MS. O'DELL: Your Honor, I understand the order to identify deponents by January 10th. But we will not have had all the documents, only for five days by the time that date rolls around. I know Ms. Sharko said they just reproduced everything again. But in fact we had 167,000 documents between Imerys and J&J until early summer.

Now, we have 324,000 documents, most of which have been produced, that additional number of documents produced in the last 90 days, and we have more coming. We are working very hard to get our arms

2.2

around those documents so we could identify those deponents.

So it's just very challenging when you've got even rolling production because you noticed in the status report J&J had said December 20th, but we got documents that will lag behind.

We can identify a certain number of deponents by January the 10th. We're working on that. We're happy to do it. But we will not be able to have opportunity to review the documents in order to ensure that a fuel universe --

JUDGE WOLFSON: I understand that you may say:
Having now had a better opportunity, there are two
more that we want. Okay. You'll identify them. The
fact that I told you to do it by January 10th doesn't
mean that it's a forever more if something else comes
up. I understand.

MS. O'DELL: Thank you.

We're just making that clear, your Honor, just telling you where we are in this process.

JUDGE WOLFSON: I hear you, and I understand it's a large job. But, on the other hand, if you recall -- I'm not sure that I need all this on the record.

(Discussion of the record.)

* * * * *

2.2

JUDGE WOLFSON: On the record.

MS. SHARKO: I would like to inform the Court that Bart Williams, who is a lawyer in the California office of the Proskauer firm and has been my client's lead counsel in California and in a Missouri case and very active in the Daubert-like proceeding called Sargon in California, is working on the Daubert issues with us for our client and will be involved here.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay.

What I had indicated off the record and I will say here, because I've had an issue arise when I've had Proskauer cases in the past or firms that my son had been affiliated with, the rules are quite clear that that does not require recusal, that relationship, and the role that she plays because she is an associate, my daughter-in-law at that firm, not a partner.

And all that I do is, I make the parties aware of that relationship, and she is not in any way involved in this litigation. I know that they have made, according to my daughter-in-law, no one can even talk around her. So that I would not be recusing myself as a result of their involvement if they do

```
28
    become involved in this case. Though, I give any
1
2
    party the opportunity to raise any concerns or
3
    objections that you would like which I would consider.
            MS. SHARKO: Thank you.
 4
5
             JUDGE WOLFSON: Anything else today?
 6
            MS. SHARKO: No.
7
             JUDGE WOLFSON: Off the record.
            (Discussion off the record.)
8
9
            THE CLERK: All rise.
10
             (Proceedings concluded.)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I, Vincent Russoniello, Official United States
Court Reporter and Certified Court Reporter of the
State of New Jersey, do hereby certify that the
foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the

9 proceedings as taken stenographically by and before me

at the time, place and on the date hereinbefore set

11 forth.

I do further certify that I am neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in this action.

23 S/Vincent Russoniello
Vincent Russoniello, CCR
Certificate No. 675

\sim	\cap

			3(
0	ABOVE-ENTITLED [1] -	array [1] - 8:24	2:10
08608 [1] - 1:8	3:10	asbestos [6] - 4:23, 8:23,	
0000 [1] - 1.0	abstract [1] - 21:11	11:10, 19:10, 19:16,	С
4	absurd [1] - 17:16	21:20	California [6] - 14:22,
1	accord [1] - 22:21	ASHCRAFT [1] - 1:14	14:23, 17:12, 27:5, 27:7,
10 [1] - 25:14	according [1] - 27:23	aside [3] - 11:10, 12:10,	27:9
10th [3] - 25:16, 26:8,	ACCURATE [1] - 3:8	19:4	cancer [2] - 17:9, 19:12
26:15	accurate [1] - 29:8	assess [2] - 7:1, 13:14	candidly [2] - 15:24, 16:2
15 [1] - 21:25	ACTION [1] - 1:2	associate [1] - 27:18	case [27] - 5:10, 6:5,
15th [1] - 23:10	action [2] - 29:14, 29:16	attack [1] - 22:1	6:25, 7:18, 8:20, 11:16,
16-MD-2738(FLW)(LHG	active [1] - 27:8	attorney [2] - 29:13,	11:20, 12:5, 12:6, 12:22,
[1] - 1:2	actual [1] - 8:1	29:15	13:23, 14:12, 14:22,
167,000 [1] - 25:20	add [2] - 14:8, 21:7	aware [2] - 19:4, 27:20	14:23, 14:25, 15:2, 15:4,
17 [2] - 7:9, 8:4	add-on [1] - 21:7	AXELROD [2] - 2:5, 2:6	15:12, 16:2, 16:21,
	additional [6] - 12:23,		17:14, 20:1, 20:12, 21:6,
2	13:3, 14:24, 15:10,	В	27:7, 28:1
20 [2] - 18:9, 21:25	15:14, 25:23	bad [1] - 12:17	cases [5] - 4:23, 11:24,
2017 [1] - 1:5	adequately [1] - 16:11	Bart [1] - 27:5	12:1, 13:23, 27:14
20th [2] - 23:9, 26:5	admissions [4] - 19:25,	based [5] - 9:12, 15:11,	categories [1] - 8:6
28 [1] - 3:7	20:6, 20:15, 21:2	19:24, 20:16, 23:4	causation [3] - 19:1,
	admit [2] - 20:7, 20:19	basic [1] - 5:12	20:8, 21:6
3	admitted [2] - 20:21,	BE [1] - 3:8	causes [1] - 17:9
30 [2] - 5:14, 18:9	23:5	BEASLEY [1] - 1:13	CCR [3] - 1:24, 3:14,
324,000 [1] - 25:22	affect [1] - 19:19	become [2] - 19:4, 28:1	29:23
37 [8] - 5:16, 5:17, 6:5,	affiliated [1] - 27:15	begin [1] - 22:5	certain [4] - 10:18, 20:8,
6:11, 6:17, 17:16, 17:18,	afternoon [1] - 11:6	beginning [2] - 11:16,	20:9, 26:7
23:24	ago [1] - 13:18	18:21	certainly [6] - 11:12,
	agree [3] - 13:7, 17:16,	behalf [3] - 1:22, 2:11,	11:15, 21:18, 22:15,
4	22:18	4:18	25:4, 25:5
402 [1] - 1:8	agreed [2] - 17:4, 18:13	Behalf [2] - 1:17, 2:6	certainty [1] - 5:24
402 [1] - 1.8	agreement [1] - 18:17	behind [1] - 26:6	Certificate [1] - 29:23
5	ahead [1] - 20:4	BEISNER [1] - 1:21	CERTIFIED [1] - 3:8
	ALABAMA [1] - 1:13	better [3] - 12:2, 13:14,	Certified [1] - 29:6
588-9516 [1] - 1:25	ALLEN [1] - 1:13	26:13	certify [2] - 29:7, 29:12
5th [1] - 23:11	almost [2] - 7:9, 14:13	between [3] - 19:9,	cetera [1] - 5:8
	amenable [1] - 22:16	23:12, 25:20	challenging [1] - 26:3
6	America [1] - 2:11	BIDDLE [1] - 1:19	changed [1] - 19:14
609 [1] - 1:25	ANN [1] - 3:8	biologic [1] - 20:9	chemistry [1] - 7:24
675 [1] - 29:23	ANN [1] - 2:10 answer [1] - 24:9	biologically [1] - 21:5	chemists [1] - 7:11
		biomedical [1] - 7:12	choosing [1] - 18:5
7	anyway [2] - 9:18, 22:1 appearances [1] - 4:4	bit [4] - 18:21, 21:19,	CHRIS [1] - 1:15
7 [1] - 1:5	application [2] - 4:8,	24:7, 24:10	CHRISTOPHER [1] -
753 [1] - 3:7	4:10	blame [1] - 10:24	1:17
	appreciates [1] - 10:21	blank [3] - 11:23, 12:3,	CIVIL [1] - 1:2
9	appropriate [1] - 7:1	16:10	clarify [1] - 6:12
	area [1] - 20:18	bolster [1] - 20:12	CLARKSON [1] - 1:7
90 [1] - 25:24	areas [7] - 5:11, 6:3,	brand [1] - 12:5	clear [2] - 26:19, 27:15
Α	6:20, 7:5, 7:8, 7:9, 15:3	bring [1] - 22:3	CLERK [2] - 4:2, 28:9
	arguing [1] - 8:14	broader [1] - 7:19	client [1] - 27:10
aback [1] - 5:18	arise [1] - 27:13	brought [1] - 12:7	client's [1] - 27:6 COHEN [1] - 1:16
able [2] - 14:18, 26:9	arms [1] - 25:25	BY [9] - 1:13, 1:15, 1:17,	collect [1] - 16:14
ABOVE [1] - 3:10	ARPS [1] - 1:21	1:19, 1:21, 2:4, 2:6, 2:8,	CONCCL[1] - 10.14
	7.1.1. O[1] 1.21		

coming [4] - 9:18, 13:15, 25:1, 25:25 Committee [1] - 1:17 committee [1] - 6:18 **complaint** [1] - 19:5 complaints [1] - 17:1 complete [4] - 9:11, 15:17, 15:20, 23:15 completed [3] - 9:3, 9:4, 10:25 **completely** [1] - 10:18 component [2] - 11:10, 21:20 concerned [1] - 6:22 concerns [1] - 28:2 concluded [1] - 28:10 **conclusion** [2] - 10:2, 10:4 conference [1] - 14:9 CONFERENCE [1] - 1:4 conferences [1] - 9:13 confused [1] - 12:4 **connection** [1] - 19:9 **consider** [1] - 28:3 constituents [1] - 7:21 consult [1] - 6:23 consulting [2] - 17:15, Continued [1] - 1:23 control [1] - 7:15 cooperative [1] - 9:15 coordinate [1] - 24:5 **copy** [2] - 10:10, 10:11 corporate [4] - 10:15, 10:22, 12:15, 17:25 correct [2] - 4:21, 20:13 **COUGHLIN** [1] - 2:8 counsel [3] - 27:7, 29:13, 29:15 count [1] - 5:13 **COURT** [5] - 1:1, 1:25, 3:15, 10:6, 20:3 court [6] - 4:1, 8:12, 12:19, 14:11, 14:14, 14:17 Court [20] - 5:25, 6:17, 7:8, 7:22, 8:2, 8:14, 8:17, 8:19, 8:25, 9:1, 10:21, 12:14, 13:8, 13:15, 13:17, 24:10, 24:23, 27:4, 29:6 Court's [1] - 15:11 COURTHOUSE [1] - 1:7

courtroom [1] - 20:2 courts [1] - 4:23 cross [2] - 4:10, 4:19 CRR [1] - 1:24

D **D.C** [2] - 1:21, 2:4 date [2] - 25:18, 29:10 dates [2] - 17:5, 23:21 Daubert [7] - 5:8, 17:10, 17:11, 22:3, 22:4, 27:8, 27:9 **Daubert-like** [3] - 17:10, 17:11, 27:8 daughter [2] - 27:18, 27:23 daughter-in-law [2] -27:18, 27:23 days [2] - 25:18, 25:24 deal [2] - 16:3, 25:10 dealing [1] - 22:8 **DECEMBER** [1] - 1:5 December [4] - 23:9, 23:10, 23:13, 26:5 decide [3] - 7:2, 11:21, 16:1 decided [1] - 12:2 decision [1] - 13:20 decision-making [1] -13:20 **Defendant** [3] - 1:22, 2:6, 2:11 defendant [2] - 11:4, 18:13 defendants [9] - 4:12, 5:24, 9:25, 11:16, 13:24, 13:25, 17:6, 24:19, 24:22 delay [5] - 22:9, 22:24, 24:4, 24:11, 24:12 delaying [1] - 22:10 demonstrate [1] - 12:20 dep [1] - 22:4 deponents [5] - 12:23, 13:2, 25:16, 26:2, 26:7 depose [1] - 25:14 deposed [1] - 25:1 deposition [8] - 4:8, 4:20, 11:24, 13:9, 13:11, 15:22, 21:4, 22:2 depositions [16] - 10:14,

10:15, 10:23, 12:15,

12:22, 13:6, 15:9, 15:14, 16:1, 16:6, 16:15, 17:4, 18:24, 23:17, 25:11 deps [2] - 12:12, 17:25 description [1] - 15:12 designate [1] - 13:21 designated [1] - 8:7 designating [1] - 6:24 designation [1] - 4:11 develop [1] - 8:1 developing [2] - 8:18, 18:8 difference [1] - 9:18 different [5] - 7:9, 7:17, 11:20, 11:21, 19:15 difficult [1] - 16:18 directed [1] - 5:9 disciplines [1] - 8:8 discovery [23] - 9:4, 9:24, 10:2, 10:4, 10:19, 11:18, 11:23, 12:10, 12:11, 13:22, 14:24, 16:3, 16:20, 17:6, 19:14, 22:17, 22:20, 22:24, 23:14, 24:4, 24:5, 24:14 discuss [1] - 15:22 discussion [5] - 4:7, 4:12, 24:22, 26:25, 28:8 **DISTRICT** [2] - 1:1, 1:1 docket [1] - 10:9 document [7] - 13:10, 15:16, 15:20, 17:19, 17:22, 17:23, 23:14 documents [21] - 9:6, 9:21, 13:4, 13:5, 13:6, 13:13, 14:11, 14:14, 14:16, 15:19, 16:23, 17:2, 20:6, 23:5, 25:17, 25:20, 25:22, 25:24, 26:1, 26:6, 26:10 done [15] - 7:25, 10:24, 11:17, 12:1, 12:19, 12:20, 14:25, 16:19, 19:2, 19:16, 20:10, 21:10, 23:13, 25:2 **DOTRO** [3] - 2:8, 9:10, 18:16 double [1] - 17:3 doubled [4] - 14:15, 15:18, 15:21, 16:24 down [3] - 15:25, 16:16, 22:20

Dr [4] - 4:9, 4:15, 4:20,

21:4 DRINKER [1] - 1:19 due [1] - 21:23 DUFFY [1] - 2:8 duplicative [1] - 8:12

Ε

early [1] - 25:21 earnest [2] - 8:1, 8:18 easily [1] - 14:18 **EAST** [1] - 1:8 either [2] - 9:19, 9:22 employee [2] - 29:13, 29:15 end [1] - 18:22 ended [1] - 21:16 engineers [1] - 7:12 **ensure** [1] - 26:10 entire [1] - 20:1 **ENTITLED** [1] - 3:10 environmental [1] - 7:15 epidemiologists [1] -7:11 epidemiology [1] - 18:11 **ERFLE** [1] - 2:11 **ESQUIRE** [13] - 1:13, 1:15, 1:15, 1:17, 1:19, 1:20, 1:21, 2:4, 2:6, 2:8, 2:9, 2:10, 2:11 **ESQUIRES** [9] - 1:13, 1:14, 1:16, 1:19, 1:21, 2:4, 2:5, 2:8, 2:10 et [1] - 5:8 **everywhere** [1] - 11:18 evidence [1] - 17:8 example [3] - 18:2, 19:20, 21:3 excuse [1] - 10:6 expanded [1] - 7:21 expect [1] - 23:15 **expected** [3] - 5:19, 6:4, expert [10] - 4:17, 6:3, 6:18, 8:9, 17:18, 18:24, 22:3, 22:4, 22:9, 23:2 expertise [1] - 5:12 experts [32] - 5:7, 5:11, 6:5, 6:11, 6:15, 6:25, 7:22, 8:7, 8:9, 8:15, 8:24, 10:10, 10:20, 10:21, 16:16, 16:19, 17:14, 17:15, 17:24,

19:3, 19:8, 19:15, 20:16, 20:22, 21:17, 21:20, 21:25, 23:23, 24:6, 24:21 explained [1] - 15:13 explore [2] - 15:3, 16:4 extra [1] - 10:11

F

fact [5] - 4:16, 12:21, 23:17, 25:20, 26:15 far [1] - 23:23 **February** [1] - 14:10 felt [1] - 7:22 **few** [1] - 5:6 FIELD [1] - 2:10 fields [1] - 7:23 fighting [1] - 24:14 figure [2] - 6:1, 19:18 file [1] - 4:13 filed [1] - 10:9 financially [1] - 29:16 fine [1] - 4:24 firm [2] - 27:6, 27:18 **FIRM** [1] - 2:5 firms [1] - 27:14 first [8] - 9:6, 12:6, 13:5, 14:9, 19:1, 23:4, 25:10 **fish** [1] - 13:16 **FISHER** [1] - 1:7 fit [1] - 20:9 fits [1] - 24:21 five [1] - 25:17 **FLOM** [1] - 1:21 focus [2] - 18:23, 19:13 focused [1] - 5:22 focusing [1] - 19:1 folks [1] - 25:1 **FOLLOWING** [1] - 3:8 **FOR** [1] - 1:1 foregoing [1] - 29:8 forever [1] - 26:16 forth [1] - 29:11 **forward** [1] - 4:15 **four** [5] - 15:7, 15:8, 15:9, 17:4, 18:12 frame [1] - 8:20 frankly [4] - 5:17, 8:3, 21:25, 24:2 Fred [1] - 4:9 **FREDA** [1] - 1:10 front [1] - 18:4

fuel [1] - 26:11 full [2] - 9:10, 23:6

G

general [1] - 19:1 generally [1] - 22:17 genetics [1] - 7:10 geologists [1] - 7:12 geology [1] - 7:23 GEREL [1] - 1:14 GORDON [1] - 2:10 great [2] - 13:7, 20:20 guess [4] - 5:13, 11:8, 11:24, 24:17 guidance [1] - 24:10

Н

hand [1] - 26:22 hands [1] - 10:8 **happy** [1] - 26:9 hard [1] - 25:25 hash [1] - 25:8 health [4] - 4:15, 7:14, 7:24 hear [2] - 11:7, 26:21 heard [2] - 6:7, 13:17 help [1] - 24:9 helpful [5] - 5:23, 5:24, 5:25, 7:8, 25:8 helps [1] - 24:5 hereby [1] - 29:7 **hereinbefore** [1] - 29:10 holiday [1] - 23:12 **Honor** [29] - 5:16, 6:7, 6:14, 7:3, 7:16, 8:13, 8:22, 9:4, 9:10, 9:14, 9:22, 10:13, 12:13, 13:4, 14:6, 15:8, 17:13, 18:10, 19:21, 21:2, 22:14, 22:19, 22:22, 24:1, 24:7, 24:17, 25:15, 26:19 Honor's [1] - 22:25 **HONORABLE** [1] - 1:10 huge [1] - 14:3

ı

identified [4] - 5:15, 12:25, 13:1, 18:12 identify [10] - 5:11, 5:21, 6:15, 16:18, 17:13, 25:14, 25:16, 26:1, 26:7, 26:14

imagine [1] - 8:22 **Imerys** [9] - 2:11, 9:5, 9:14, 10:16, 12:15, 15:10, 15:19, 23:10, 25:20 immediately [1] - 4:15 **importance** [1] - 13:7 **important** [3] - 6:20, 9:22, 16:7 IN [2] - 1:4, 3:9 indeed [2] - 6:16, 7:6 independently [1] -20:23 indicated [7] - 4:19, 9:5, 12:14, 13:5, 24:20, 24:25, 27:12 indicating [1] - 9:17 individual [2] - 8:1, 8:11 individual's [1] - 13:10 **individuals** [5] - 6:17, 7:11, 8:3, 13:20, 23:20 inform [1] - 27:4 **information** [2] - 10:22, 16:15 informed [1] - 13:19 inquiry [1] - 4:14 instance [1] - 25:10 intend [1] - 8:19 intended [1] - 8:16 interested [1] - 29:16 interject [1] - 18:17 interrogatories [1] - 10:5 introduce [1] - 7:22 **introduced** [1] - 8:25 involved [4] - 18:5, 27:10, 27:22, 28:1 **involvement** [1] - 27:25 IS [1] - 3:8 issue [9] - 5:7, 7:20, 8:23, 11:8, 11:14, 15:5,

J

21:13, 25:10, 27:13

27:9

issues [11] - 4:17, 8:23,

10:5, 11:15, 11:22, 16:3,

16:4, 19:4, 19:15, 20:8,

J&J [9] - 4:18, 10:16, 12:16, 13:2, 15:9, 15:19, 19:4, 25:21, 26:5 J&J's [1] - 23:6 January [8] - 9:6, 15:22,

23:11, 23:16, 25:14, 25:16, 26:8, 26:15 **JERSEY** [1] - 1:1 **Jersey** [2] - 17:11, 29:7 job [2] - 11:25, 26:22 **JOHN** [1] - 1:21 **JOHNSON** [2] - 1:4 Johnson [2] - 1:22 **JUDGE** [37] - 4:3, 4:6, 4:24, 5:5, 5:17, 6:9, 6:13, 6:22, 7:4, 9:7, 9:12, 9:16, 10:8, 11:1, 12:25, 14:3, 14:7, 16:22, 17:21, 18:14, 18:19, 19:22, 20:11, 20:14, 21:7, 21:12, 22:23, 23:3, 24:12, 25:6, 25:13, 26:12, 26:21, 27:3, 27:11, 28:5, 28:7 Judge [16] - 4:11, 5:1, 11:17, 14:20, 14:22, 15:5, 15:13, 15:15, 18:2, 18:16, 22:12, 23:7, 23:18, 24:24, 25:3 judgment [1] - 12:18 JULIE [1] - 1:20 **July** [1] - 18:4 June [1] - 15:8

Κ

jury [1] - 20:21

keep [1] - 8:11 kicking [1] - 24:13 kind [3] - 22:9, 22:10, 24:8 kinds [2] - 14:18, 19:15 knows [1] - 18:10

L

lag [1] - 26:6 large [2] - 7:6, 26:22 larger [2] - 9:1, 13:21 last [5] - 5:9, 6:19, 9:20, 23:10, 25:24 law [2] - 27:18, 27:23 lawyer [1] - 27:5 lawyers [1] - 12:8 lay [1] - 20:1 lead [1] - 27:7 leadership [1] - 6:18 learn [1] - 12:9 LEIGH [1] - 1:13

Р

letter [2] - 11:3, 11:6 **limitation** [1] - 15:1 limited [3] - 4:21, 12:14, 12:22 list [4] - 7:21, 17:16, 24:25 litigated [1] - 4:22 **litigation** [2] - 13:25, 27:22 **LOCKE** [1] - 2:4 look [2] - 10:4, 20:21 **looking** [3] - 6:23, 7:18, 10:3 looks [1] - 10:2 **LORNA** [1] - 2:8 lost [1] - 12:1

move [3] - 18:19, 18:20, 24:16 moving [1] - 4:15 MR [10] - 14:8, 18:2, 18:15, 18:18, 19:20, 19:23, 20:5, 20:13, 21:1, 21:10 **MS** [27] - 4:21, 5:4, 5:16, 6:7, 6:12, 6:14, 7:3, 7:5, 9:10, 9:14, 9:19, 10:12, 12:13, 13:1, 14:5, 16:23, 18:16, 22:14, 22:24, 24:1, 24:17, 25:12, 25:15, 26:18, 27:4, 28:4, 28:6 mutual [1] - 22:17 **MY** [1] - 3:9

Ν

O'DELL [3] - 1:13, 25:15,

numbers [2] - 7:6, 9:1

numerous [1] - 17:10

25:23, 26:7

26:18 **OBGYNs** [1] - 7:12 objections [4] - 23:7, 23:19, 25:11, 28:3 obviously [1] - 12:19 occupational [2] - 7:14, 7:24 October [2] - 15:6, 15:14 **OF** [3] - 1:1, 1:4, 3:9 office [1] - 27:6 Official [1] - 29:5 **OFFICIAL** [2] - 1:25, 3:15 old [1] - 22:10 once [2] - 22:1, 23:15 oncologists [1] - 7:10 one [16] - 4:14, 8:11, 10:6, 11:7, 11:19, 11:20, 12:6, 14:9, 14:21, 14:23, 15:24, 21:1, 21:13, 25:4, 27:23 one-by-one [1] - 21:13 ones [1] - 9:21 open [3] - 4:1, 20:1, 21:16 open-ended [1] - 21:16 opine [1] - 20:22 opining [2] - 19:8, 20:16 opinion [2] - 14:23, 21:8 opinions [4] - 8:19, 19:17, 19:19, 20:23 opportunity [5] - 15:23, 24:20, 26:10, 26:13, opposed [1] - 16:8 order [7] - 5:10, 8:19, 16:1, 16:14, 16:20, 25:16, 26:10 orderly [2] - 24:23, 25:2 **OREGON** [1] - 2:11 original [1] - 15:12 originally [1] - 15:19 ovarian [2] - 17:9, 19:11 overlap [1] - 8:8 overwhelming [1] - 8:3 own [6] - 19:24, 20:15,

20:16, 20:24, 21:8, 21:9

paper [1] - 10:10 parameters [1] - 21:15 **PARFITT** [17] - 1:15, 5:16, 6:7, 6:12, 6:14, 7:3, 7:5, 9:14, 9:19, 10:12, 12:13, 13:1, 14:5, 22:14, 24:1, 24:17, 25:12 part [4] - 9:6, 11:11, 11:12, 24:18 particular [3] - 8:8, 13:23, 19:5 particularly [1] - 25:9 parties [5] - 15:3, 15:10, 22:18, 27:20, 29:14 partner [1] - 27:19 party [4] - 10:23, 14:16, 16:6, 28:2 pass [1] - 12:17 past [2] - 18:9, 27:14 pathologists [1] - 7:13 pause [1] - 10:7 **PCPC** [5] - 2:6, 10:17, 12:16, 14:1, 23:9 pending [1] - 4:11 PENNSYLVANIA [2] -2:6, 2:10 people [11] - 6:17, 13:16, 14:18, 15:7, 15:8, 15:9, 17:5, 17:16, 18:3, 18:7, 19:25 people's [1] - 13:9 perhaps [3] - 11:8, 22:16, 24:7 perineal [1] - 17:8 period [1] - 16:13 perspective [1] - 7:19 pharmacologist [1] -8:10 phasing [1] - 21:19 phonebook [1] - 17:17 picture [1] - 13:22 **Pisano** [11] - 4:11, 5:1, 14:20, 15:5, 15:13, 15:15, 22:12, 23:8, 23:19, 24:24, 25:3 place [1] - 29:10 **PLACITELLA** [2] - 1:16, 1:17 plaintiff [5] - 4:10, 5:11, 17:1, 17:7, 17:13

М

management [1] - 5:10 MARK [1] - 2:9 **MARKETING** [1] - 1:4 material [3] - 7:13, 7:23, 10:19 materials [1] - 5:3 **MATTER** [1] - 3:10 matter [1] - 4:22 **MDL** [4] - 4:20, 4:21, 14:19, 16:8 **MEAGHER** [1] - 1:21 mean [1] - 26:16 mechanism [1] - 24:11 mechanisms [1] - 21:5 mechanistic [1] - 18:11 meet [1] - 15:21 meeting [2] - 22:12, 25:3 members [1] - 6:18 met [1] - 14:20 **MICHELLE** [1] - 1:15 microscopists [1] - 7:13 might [8] - 7:7, 7:22, 8:7, 8:9, 9:1, 19:11, 22:9, 24:9 Missouri [1] - 27:7 moment [2] - 7:17, 11:7 moments [1] - 5:6 money [1] - 5:2 month [1] - 23:10 months [1] - 25:2 most [4] - 8:4, 9:7, 9:21, 25:22 motion [1] - 22:3 motions [2] - 7:1, 22:4

named [1] - 18:3 names [1] - 18:4 **NANCY** [1] - 2:11 narrow [1] - 23:25 **narrowing** [1] - 5:25 nature [1] - 8:12 necessarily [1] - 22:5 necessary [4] - 18:1, 22:20, 24:6 need [19] - 4:14, 12:9, 13:9, 13:10, 16:1, 16:11, 16:14, 16:19, 16:20, 17:19, 18:19, 18:20, 18:21, 18:23, 20:6, 22:20, 23:1, 25:7, 26:23 needed [6] - 14:12, 14:25, 15:3, 15:15, 15:23, 18:24 New [2] - 17:11, 29:7 new [6] - 8:24, 11:14, 12:6, 17:2, 21:20, 22:9 **NEW** [1] - 1:1 next [1] - 15:25 **NJ** [1] - 1:8 **NO** [1] - 1:2 noted [2] - 4:4, 14:24 **NOTES** [1] - 3:9 nothing [1] - 4:24 **notice** [2] - 4:8, 4:19 noticed [1] - 26:4 notify [1] - 5:1 **number** [11] - 8:3, 10:16, 12:14, 12:16, 15:18, 16:16, 16:23, 17:1, 17:3,

plaintiff's [1] - 6:2 Plaintiffs [1] - 1:17 **plan** [6] - 13:12, 22:17, 22:24, 24:4, 24:8 planned [1] - 25:5 plausibility [1] - 20:9 **plausible** [1] - 21:5 players [1] - 12:8 plays [3] - 13:21, 14:1, 27:17 plethora [1] - 13:16 point [9] - 10:1, 10:19, 12:21, 14:21, 15:6, 15:15, 16:19, 22:15, 24:17 **Pooley** [3] - 4:9, 4:16, 4:20 position [2] - 11:17, 13:14 possibly [2] - 5:21, 6:2 **POWDER** [1] - 1:4 powder [2] - 7:20, 17:9 power [1] - 14:17 practical [1] - 23:14 **PRACTICES** [1] - 1:5 preliminarily [1] - 13:1 present [5] - 22:19, 23:7, 24:23, 24:25, 25:7 presentation [1] - 22:22 presented [1] - 11:13 previously [2] - 8:25, 16:9 primarily [1] - 18:6 problem [2] - 11:5, 20:21 proceeding [3] - 17:11, 17:12, 27:8 proceedings [3] - 14:15, 28:10, 29:9 process [8] - 10:24, 13:3, 18:5, 18:21, 22:5, 24:8, 24:20, 26:20 processing [1] - 24:18 produce [2] - 17:4, 18:13 produced [5] - 9:8, 16:23, 22:6, 25:23, 25:24 product [1] - 19:10 production [13] - 9:9, 9:11, 10:3, 10:4, 14:11, 15:16, 15:20, 17:2, 17:20, 17:22, 17:23, 23:6, 26:4 products [2] - 7:20, 17:9

PRODUCTS [1] - 1:4
Proskauer [2] - 27:6,
27:14
protocol [1] - 15:22
prove [2] - 17:7, 17:14
provide [1] - 24:10
provided [1] - 10:20
public [1] - 7:14
pure [1] - 19:10
purity [1] - 18:7
PURSUANT [1] - 3:7
put [4] - 12:10, 19:3,
20:20, 24:3
putting [3] - 10:8, 11:10,
24:8

Q

qualifying [1] - 14:5 quality [1] - 7:14 quash [2] - 4:8, 4:10 quickly [3] - 18:20, 23:20 quite [1] - 27:15 quote [1] - 19:4

R

radiation [1] - 7:10 raise [2] - 11:9, 28:2 raised [2] - 15:5, 15:7 **RE**[1] - 1:4 read [1] - 21:3 real [1] - 5:19 **realize** [1] - 7:5 really [9] - 4:17, 5:22, 8:24, 9:17, 13:14, 16:10, 17:25, 18:23, 23:1 reason [3] - 7:16, 14:2, 25:6 reasons [1] - 14:16 **REATH** [1] - 1:19 record [8] - 4:6, 20:7, 26:24, 26:25, 27:3, 27:12, 28:7, 28:8 recusal [1] - 27:16 recusing [1] - 27:24 redid [1] - 17:2 **REES** [1] - 2:10 regard [6] - 4:7, 4:14, 7:7, 7:19, 10:5, 13:19 regardless [1] - 20:18 regulatory [2] - 7:10, 8:9 relationship [2] - 27:16, 27:21

relying [2] - 10:22, 20:24 render [1] - 6:25 report [1] - 26:5 Reporter [2] - 29:6 **REPORTER** [2] - 1:25, 3:15 reports [7] - 6:25, 7:7, 8:1, 17:18, 18:25, 21:23, 23:2 represent [4] - 6:16, 8:16, 16:12, 16:20 representation [1] -14:10 representing [1] - 8:14 reproduced [1] - 25:19 request [3] - 21:14, 23:17, 25:3 require [1] - 27:16 requires [1] - 21:21 resolve [1] - 21:12 response [1] - 4:13 result [3] - 4:18, 5:7, 27:25 results [1] - 12:19 review [4] - 5:3, 19:24, 20:17, 26:10 reviewed [2] - 18:8, 23:8 **RFPs** [1] - 10:5 **ripe** [1] - 4:18 rise [2] - 4:2, 28:9 role [5] - 4:16, 13:22, 14:1, 14:4, 27:17 rolling [2] - 18:25, 26:4 rolls [1] - 25:18 **ROTH** [1] - 1:16 round [1] - 9:21 **RPR** [1] - 1:24 rules [1] - 27:15 run [1] - 16:3 **Russoniello** [4] - 3:14, 29:5, 29:22, 29:23 RUSSONIELLO [2] -

relative [2] - 29:12, 29:15

relevance [1] - 20:9

rely [2] - 21:1, 21:3

S

S/Vincent [2] - 3:14, 29:22 SALES [1] - 1:5 samples [1] - 8:23

1:24, 3:14

Sargon [1] - 27:9 saw [1] - 5:18 schedule [1] - 23:4 scheduling [1] - 23:21 science [14] - 7:14, 7:23, 11:11, 11:12, 15:12, 16:5, 17:24, 18:8, 18:25, 19:3, 19:9, 19:13, 20:17, 20:25 sciences [1] - 7:15 scientific [1] - 19:19 scientifically [1] - 17:8 seated [1] - 4:3 second [2] - 10:6, 23:16 **SECTION** [1] - 3:7 see [8] - 10:1, 12:4, 13:9, 15:17, 19:13, 23:15, 24:20, 25:13 sense [1] - 24:4 serve [1] - 6:2 set [3] - 21:15, 22:12, 29:10 **SEYFARRTH** [1] - 2:4 **Sharko** [5] - 4:18, 11:2, 16:22, 22:23, 25:19 **SHARKO** [8] - 1:19, 4:21, 5:4, 16:23, 22:24, 27:4, 28:4, 28:6 **SHAW** [1] - 2:4 **SHERYL** [1] - 2:6 **show** [1] - 8:19 side [1] - 22:21 **SILVER** [1] - 2:9 similar [1] - 10:16 simply [2] - 8:14, 10:1 sit [2] - 14:13, 22:19 sitting [1] - 15:25 situation [1] - 9:20 **SKADDEN** [1] - 1:21 **slate** [3] - 11:23, 12:3, 16:10 **SLATE** [1] - 1:21 someone [1] - 22:9 **sometimes** [1] - 9:20 somewhere [1] - 23:9 son [1] - 27:14 soon [1] - 17:19 sorry [1] - 18:16 **sound** [1] - 17:8 sounds [1] - 22:24 speaking [1] - 5:6 specialties [2] - 7:18, 8:5 **specialty** [1] - 8:4

spend [1] - 5:2 square [3] - 11:19, 11:20, 12:6 **staggering** [2] - 21:23, 24:8 stand [1] - 20:23 stands [1] - 21:9 start [2] - 18:24, 23:20 started [2] - 13:3, 14:8 **starting** [5] - 11:18, 11:19, 12:5, 16:10, 21:16 **STATE** [1] - 1:8 State [1] - 29:7 state [5] - 4:22, 12:19, 14:11, 14:14, 14:17 states [1] - 16:9 **STATES** [2] - 1:1, 1:7 States [1] - 29:5 statisticians [1] - 7:11 status [2] - 14:9, 26:5 **STATUS** [1] - 1:4 Steering [1] - 1:17 STENOGRAPHIC [1] stenographically [1] -29:9 still [2] - 9:4, 19:18 stop [1] - 17:22 **STREET** [1] - 1:8 studies [7] - 18:11, 18:12, 19:6, 19:7, 20:10 **study** [1] - 19:5 **submission** [3] - 5:18, 5:20, 10:9 subpoena [1] - 14:17 suggested [2] - 14:21, 15:21 suggesting [2] - 9:23, 12:18 **suggestion** [1] - 24:2 summary [1] - 5:12 summer [1] - 25:21 supplemental [2] - 9:9, 23:11 supplementation [1] -12:11 **support** [4] - 16:2, 20:8, 21:6, 21:8 **supports** [1] - 19:9 surprised [1] - 11:2 surprises [1] - 20:4 **SUSAN** [1] - 1:19

Т talc [2] - 18:7, 19:10 Talc [1] - 2:11 talcum [2] - 7:20, 17:9 teed [1] - 23:18 **TERSIGNI** [1] - 1:20 tested [1] - 18:7 testifies [1] - 19:24 testify [1] - 7:2 testimony [1] - 21:4 testing [1] - 8:23 **THE** [9] - 1:1, 1:10, 2:5, 3:7, 3:9, 4:2, 10:6, 20:3, 28:9 they've [1] - 18:13 thinking [2] - 22:7, 25:8 third [4] - 10:23, 14:16, 15:10, 16:6 third-party [3] - 10:23, 14:16, 16:6 **THOMAS** [1] - 2:4 **THORNTON** [1] - 2:10 thousands [1] - 16:7 three [5] - 9:24, 10:15, 12:15, 13:24, 23:12 throwing [1] - 22:10 timing [2] - 5:8, 21:15 **TISI** [11] - 1:15, 14:8, 18:2, 18:15, 18:18, 19:20, 19:23, 20:5, 20:13, 21:1, 21:10 **TITLE** [1] - 3:7 **TO** [2] - 3:7, 3:8 today [7] - 4:13, 4:18, 14:13, 21:13, 21:15, 22:11, 28:5 together [2] - 24:3, 24:9 toxicologist [2] - 8:10, 19:23 toxicologists [2] - 7:13, 18:6 toxicology [1] - 18:12 transcript [1] - 29:8 **TRANSCRIPT** [2] - 1:4, TRANSCRIPTION [1] -3:9 **TRENTON** [1] - 1:8 trial [3] - 7:2, 15:2, 20:20 trials [1] - 17:10 tried [1] - 11:14

true [2] - 18:16, 29:8

try [2] - 8:11, 22:21 trying [4] - 13:19, 15:25, 16:2, 19:18 twice [1] - 14:14 two [8] - 8:5, 8:6, 8:7, 10:16, 12:16, 13:25, 15:25, 26:13 types [1] - 13:20

U

U.S [2] - 1:25, 3:15
U.S.C [1] - 3:7
ultimately [2] - 5:7, 10:20
understood [3] - 15:1,
15:18, 21:4
unfortunately [1] - 13:22
United [1] - 29:5
UNITED [2] - 1:1, 1:7
universe [3] - 5:20,
23:24, 26:11
unnecessarily [1] - 13:8
up [3] - 22:13, 23:18,
26:17
USDJ [1] - 1:10

6:9, 6:13, 6:22, 7:4, 9:7, 9:12, 9:16, 10:8, 11:1, 12:25, 14:3, 14:7, 16:22, 17:21, 18:14, 18:19, 19:22, 20:11, 20:14, 21:7, 21:12, 22:23, 23:3, 24:12, 25:6, 25:13, 26:12, 26:21, 27:3, 27:11, 28:5, 28:7 women [3] - 16:8, 16:12, 16:21 won [1] - 12:1 world [2] - 8:15, 15:17 writing [1] - 11:22 written [2] - 12:11, 24:14 wrote [1] - 14:22

4:3, 4:6, 4:24, 5:5, 5:17,

Υ

year [3] - 6:19, 13:17, 24:14 years [2] - 18:9, 20:18

W

٧

various [2] - 14:16, 24:21

VINCENT [2] - 1:24, 3:14

Vincent [2] - 29:5, 29:23

VIRGINIA [2] - 1:15, 1:15

wait [2] - 15:16, 17:19 waiting [3] - 10:1, 17:21, 17:23 Wales [1] - 4:9 WASHINGTON [2] -1:21, 2:4 waste [1] - 5:2 waves [1] - 9:24 week [2] - 15:25, 23:16 weeks [1] - 23:12 wheelhouse [1] - 8:11 Williams [1] - 27:5 willing [1] - 21:18 winnow [1] - 16:16 withdrawn [2] - 4:19, 4:25 witness [1] - 4:17 witnesses [2] - 20:7, 23:18 WOLFSON [38] - 1:10,